1	DEVERIE J. CHRISTENSEN, ESQ.	
2	Nevada State Bar No. 6596	
3	JOSHUA A. SLIKER, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 12493 JACKSON LEWIS P.C.	
4		
	300 S. Fourth Street, Suite 900 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101	
5	Telephone: (702) 921-2460	
6		
7	joshua.sliker@jacksonlewis.com	
8	Attorneys for Defendant Allegiant Air, LLC	
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
11	INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF	
12	TEAMSTERS, AIRLINE DIVISION; AIRLINE PROFESSIONALS	Case No. 2:21-cv-00374-KJD-DJA
13	ASSOCIATION TEAMSTERS LOCAL UNION NO. 2118,	
14	Plaintiffs,	STIPULATION TO EXTEND DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS DEADLINE
15	VS.	(THIRD REQUEST)
16	ALLEGIANT AIR, LLC,	
17	Defendant.	
18		
19	Plaintiffs, INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, AIRLINE DIVISION; and	
20	AIRLINE PROFESSIONALS ASSOCIATION TEAMSTERS LOCAL UNION NO. 2118 ("Plaintiffs"),	
21	by and through their counsel of record, The Urban Law Firm; and Defendant ALLEGIANT AIR, LLC	
22	("Defendant"), by and through its counsel of record, Jackson Lewis, P.C. and Jones Day, stipulate and	
23	request that the Court extend the dispositive motions deadline, which is currently March 28, 2022, by sixty	
24	(60) days, to May 27, 2022. This is the third stipulation or request for an extension of time to file	
25	dispositive motions in this matter. As explained in detail below, there is good cause to grant this	
26	stipulation pursuant to LR 26-3. In support of this stipulation, the parties state as follows:	
27	1. Plaintiffs filed their complaint on March 5, 2021. (Dkt. 1). In that pleading, Plaintiffs	

allege that Defendant has breached the terms of the parties' collective bargaining agreement by refusing

28

to arbitrate over a grievance challenging how Defendant creates pilot schedules.

- 2. On March 30, 2021, Defendant filed a Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction, in which it argues that the Court lacks jurisdiction because (1) the parties in this case are subject to the Railway Labor Act ("RLA") and not the Labor Management Relations Act; (2) under the RLA, Plaintiffs' claim is a minor dispute over which this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction; and (3) Plaintiffs' request for an affirmative injunction ordering arbitration is barred by the Norris-LaGuardia Act. (Dkt. 5). Plaintiffs disagreed with these contentions and filed an opposition on April 13, 2021. (Dkt. 12). Defendant filed its reply in support of that motion on April 2021. (Dkt. 14). Defendant's motion has been fully briefed and is ripe for resolution by the Court.
- 3. On May 14, 2021, the parties submitted their Joint Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order. (Dkt. 15). As the parties explained in that filing, given the nature of this case, the parties did not anticipate a need for discovery, believe that this case should be decided based on dispositive motions, and that no trial will be needed.
- 4. On May 17, 2021, the Court adopted the parties' proposed schedule, and entered an order setting forth the following deadlines:
 - a. June 29, 2021 deadline to file amended pleadings;
 - b. September 27, 2021 deadline to complete discovery; and
 - c. October 27, 2021 deadline to file dispositive motions (Dkt. 18).
- 5. Because the parties do not believe a trial will be needed, no trial date or deadline for joint pre-trial motions have been set in this case.
- 6. Neither party elected to conduct discovery, and pursuant to the Court's Scheduling Order, discovery has closed in this case. The parties are not seeking to reopen discovery or extend that deadline through this stipulation. Nor are the parties seeking to change the deadline for amended pleadings.
- 7. On October 14, 2021, the parties requested that the Court grant relief from the then-current dispositive motion deadline of October 27, 2021. (Dkt. 20). On October 20, 2021, the Court granted in part and denied in part the parties' request, and extended the deadline to file dispositive motions to January 27, 2022. (Dkt. 24). On January 4, 2022, the parties jointly requested the Court extend the dispositive motions deadline that was set on January 27, 2022. (Dkt. 24). The Court granted that motion on January

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

5, 2022, and extended the dispositive motions deadline to March 28, 2022. (Dkt. 25).

8. The parties hereby request that the Court extend the dispositive motions deadline for sixty days. As noted in the parties' initial requests, the Court's resolution of Defendant's pending motion to dismiss will, in all likelihood, eliminate the need to file additional briefing. Moreover, any motions for summary judgment would likely be based on the same evidence and arguments already presented in support of and opposition to Defendant's motion to dismiss. As such, extending the dispositive motions deadline to permit the Court to first rule on Defendant's pending motion to dismiss would avoid unnecessary duplication of work, and conserve Court and party resources.

9. Therefore, for all the reasons set forth herein and for good cause having been shown, the parties stipulate and request that the Court enter an order extending the dispositive motions deadline, which is currently March 28, 2022, by sixty (60) days, to May 27, 2022.

Dated: March 7, 2022

THE URBAN LAW FIRM

Michael A. Urban MICHAEL A. URBAN, ESO.

Nevada Bar No. 3875

4270 S. Decatur Blvd., Suite A-9

Las Vegas, Nevada 89103 Telephone: 702.968.8087 Facsimile: 702.968.8088

Email: murban@theurbanlawfirm.com

Attorney for Plaintiffs

ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED.

HON. DANIEL J. ALBREGTS UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DATED: March 8, 2022

Dated: March 7, 2022 JACKSON LEWIS P.C.

Joshua A. Sliker

JOSHUA A. SLIKER, ESO. Nevada Bar No. 12493

JONES DAY

DOUGLAS W. HALL, ESQ. (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*) 51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001 Telephone: (202) 879-3939 Email: dwhall@jonesday.com

AARON S. MARKEL (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*) 150 West Jefferson Avenue, Suite 2100 Detroit, Michigan 48226

Telephone: (313) 230-7929 Email: amarkel@jonesday.com

Attorneys for Defendant

Because Defendant's motion to dismiss was based on a lack of jurisdiction pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1), the parties could – and did – submit declarations that the Court may consider in deciding the motion.